

RECEIVED

JUL 27 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

HOGAN & HARTSON
L.L.P.

July 27, 2000

COLUMBIA SQUARE
555 THIRTEENTH STREET, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-1109
TEL (202) 637-5600
FAX (202) 637-5910
WWW.HHLAW.COM

Magalie Roman Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C.

BOOKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

Re: CC Docket No. 96-45
Western Wireless Corporation Petition to Reject
Rural Telephone Company Self-Certification for
Valor Telecommunications of New Mexico, LLC, and
Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP
and
Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP,
and GTE Southwest Incorporated
Petition for Waiver of the Definition of "Study Area"
of the Appendix - Glossary of Part 36
DA 00-1015

Dear Ms. Salas:

On behalf of Western Wireless Corporation ("Western Wireless"), enclosed please find an original and six (6) copies of Western Wireless's Petition to Reject the Rural Telephone Company Self-Certification filed by Valor Telecommunications of New Mexico, LLC, and Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP (together "Valor"). The Petition asks that the Commission reject Valor's self-certification for treatment as a rural telephone company for universal service and other purposes, and that the Commission issue a public notice and solicit comment in support of same. Western Wireless also requests that the Petition be submitted as an *ex parte* filing in the matter of the Petition for Waiver filed by Valor and GTE Southwest Incorporated ("GTE") seeking a waiver of the Commission's study area freeze to allow certain exchanges Valor is purchasing from GTE to be removed from GTE's study area in Texas and placed into a Valor study area in that state.

No. of Copies rec'd 6
List A B C D E

BRUSSELS BUDAPEST* LONDON MOSCOW PARIS* PRAGUE* WARSAW

BALTIMORE, MD BOULDER, CO COLORADO SPRINGS, CO DENVER, CO LOS ANGELES, CA MCLEAN, VA NEW YORK, NY

\\DC - 68551/2 - #1152144 v1

* Affiliated Office

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.


Magalie Roman Salas

July 27, 2000

Page 2

If you have any questions, please contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Ronnie London', is written over the typed name.

Ronnie London

Counsel for Western Wireless Corporation

Enclosure

cc: Valor Telecommunications

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, DC 20554**

In the Matter of)

Self-Certification of)
Valor Telecommunications of)
New Mexico, LLC, and)
Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP)
as Rural Telephone Companies)

Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP)
and GTE Southwest Incorporated)
Joint Petition for Waiver of the)
Definition of "Study Area" of the)
Appendix – Glossary of Part 36)

Federal-State Joint Board on)
Universal Service)

RECEIVED

JUL 27 2000

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

DA No. 00-1015

CC Docket No. 96-45

**PETITION TO REJECT
RURAL TELEPHONE COMPANY SELF-CERTIFICATION**

Western Wireless Corporation ("Western Wireless"), by its attorneys and pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 1.2, hereby requests that the Commission reject the self-certification letter filed by Valor Telecommunications Southwest, LLC, and subsidiaries Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP, and Valor Telecommunications of New Mexico, LLC (collectively, "Valor"), on June 27, 2000 ("Valor RTC Letter"), purporting to have those carriers certified as rural telephone companies ("RTCs") under 47 U.S.C. § 153(37). 1/ The Valor RTC Letter, which was filed to allow Valor to participate in federal support mechanisms for rural telephone companies, states that Valor satisfies the RTC criteria under subsection D of the

1/ A copy of the Valor RTC Letter is attached hereto.

definition in Section 3(37) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (the "Act"). 2/ However, as demonstrated below, Valor does not qualify as an RTC, and the Commission should reject Valor's claim to be treated as such. 3/

I. BACKGROUND

Western Wireless is a commercial mobile radio service ("CMRS") provider that has petitioned for designation as an eligible telecommunications carrier ("ETC") in 15 states, including Texas and New Mexico. In particular, Western Wireless currently has applications pending before the Public Utility Commission of Texas ("Texas PUC") and the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission ("New Mexico PRC") to be designated as an ETC in each of those states. 4/ Western Wireless seeks ETC status in geographic areas in both Texas

2/ 47 U.S.C. § 153(37)(D).

3/ The instant Petition to Reject is also being filed as an *ex parte* comment in response to *GTE Southwest, Inc., and Valor Telecommunications of Texas Seek Waiver of the Definition of "Study Area" in Part 36 of the Commission's Rules*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Public Notice, FCC 00-1015 (released May 8, 2000) ("Waiver Petition"). Western Wireless respectfully requests that any Commission grant of the Waiver Petition explicitly state that Valor shall not be treated as an RTC under Sections 3(37), 214(e), 251(f)(1), 254, or any other provisions of the Act or the Commission's rules. 47 U.S.C. §§ 153(37), 214(e), 251(f)(1), 254.

4/ See *Application of WWC Texas RSA Limited Partnership for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 214(e) and PUC Subst. R. 26.418, and as an Eligible Telecommunications Provider Pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 214(e) and PUC Subst. R. 26.417*, SOAH Docket no. 473-00-1167, PUC Docket No. 22289 (Texas PUC 2000) ("Western Wireless Texas ETC Petition"); *GCC License Corporation Petition for Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier*, Docket No. 98-484-TC, Utility Case No. 2921 ("Western Wireless New Mexico ETC Petition").

and New Mexico that include exchanges that Valor proposes to acquire, 5/ but that are currently served by GTE. Because GTE is not an RTC, the state commissions do not have to make any “public interest” findings under Section 214(e)(2) of the Act before designating Western Wireless as an ETC for those locations. 6/

Valor sought to intervene in Western Wireless’ ETC proceedings before the state commissions, and has sought treatment as an RTC in those proceedings. Because Western Wireless is not proposing to include within its designated service area all of the GTE exchanges being purchased by Valor, Valor’s RTC claims could result in competitive services being denied to consumers due to the federal requirement that competitive ETCs serve the whole of an RTC’s service area. 7/ Thus, Western Wireless has a direct interest in Valor’s claim to RTC status.

Western Wireless is submitting the instant Petition to Reject to challenge Valor’s self-certification as an RTC, in the absence of any established Commission procedure for raising such a challenge. The FCC has established a streamlined procedure whereby local exchange carriers (“LECs”) wishing to be treated as RTCs must file a self-certification with the FCC and their state

5/ As discussed *infra* at Section II, Valor is purchasing approximately 315,000 access lines in Texas and 85,000 access lines in New Mexico from GTE Southwest, Inc. (“GTE”).

6/ See 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(2) (“the State commission may in the case of an area served by [an RTC], and shall, in the case of all other areas, designate more than one common carrier as an [ETC] Before designating an additional [ETC] for an area served by [an RTC], the State commission shall find that the designation is in the public interest.”).

7/ See 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(5). Western Wireless has not proposed to serve the whole of these exchanges because they are outside the coverage permitted by Western Wireless’s FCC licenses.

commission setting forth the basis for their RTC status, and they must update that filing if their status changes after their initial filing. ^{8/} However, the Commission has not established any means by which interested parties can challenge a LEC's claim that it qualifies as an RTC. Once a self-certified RTC's status is questioned, though, it is incumbent upon the Commission to make a determination as to whether or not a carrier meets the RTC qualifications. Western Wireless respectfully requests that the Commission expeditiously issue a Public Notice seeking comment on this petition and, based on the record gathered in response to such notice, issue a ruling that Valor is not entitled to RTC status.

II. FACTS

Valor is a recently established, closely-held company, funded by private equity investor Welsh, Carson, Anderson and Stowe, along with the venture capital divisions of Citicorp and Vestar. Valor is in the process of acquiring exchanges being sold by GTE. In particular, Valor is in the process of acquiring nearly 400,000 local access lines being sold by GTE in New Mexico and Texas, ^{9/} approximately 315,000 of which are in Texas.

^{8/} See *Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, CC Docket No. 96-45, Tenth Report and Order, 14 FCC Rcd 20156, 20350-54, ¶¶ 440-49 (1999).

^{9/} See <http://www.valortelecom.com/socoinfo2.html>. Valor has also agreed to purchase an additional 120,092 GTE lines in Oklahoma. *Id.* Notably, the Valor RTC Letter does not purport to self-certify that Valor is an RTC in Oklahoma.

Valor did not exist before 1999 and has no “study area” for purposes of the Act and the FCC’s rules. Due to the FCC’s study area freeze, 10/ the exchanges Valor is purchasing from GTE remain in GTE’s study areas, and no Valor study areas may exist unless and until the Commission waives the study area freeze for the transaction. 11/ GTE and Valor filed the Waiver Petition to allow the exchanges Valor is purchasing to be removed from GTE’s two Texas study areas and placed into a single new Valor study area in Texas. 12/ Valor has not consummated its purchase of lines from GTE, and cannot do so until the Commission grants the Waiver Petition. 13/

Despite the fact that Valor has not consummated the GTE transaction and presently provides no service in Texas, New Mexico, or anywhere else – and never has – the company filed the Valor RTC Letter purporting to self-certify that it qualifies for treatment as an RTC. The Valor RTC Letter claims that Valor

10/ See 47 C.F.R. § 36 app. (defining “study area”). See also *MTS and WATS Market Structure, Amendment of Part 67 of the Commission’s Rules and Establishment of a Joint Board, Recommended Decision and Order*, 49 Fed. Reg. 48325 (1984); *Decision and Order*, 50 Fed. Reg. 939 (1985); *Amendment of Part 36 of the Commission’s Rules and Establishment of a Joint Board*, CC Docket No. 80-286, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, 5 FCC Rcd 5974 (1990).

11/ See *supra* note 3.

12/ *Id.* According to a study area freeze waiver petition filed in another context and yet to be placed on public notice, GTE and Valor did not file a waiver petition for New Mexico because, they contend, “the GTE/Valor transaction involved GTE’s entire New Mexico study area [so] no waiver request was filed or necessary[.]” See Joint Petition for Expedited Waiver, filed by Mescalero Apache Telecom Inc., GTE Southwest Incorporated and Valor Telecommunications of New Mexico, LLC, for Waiver of the Definition of “Study Area” Contained in Part 36, Appendix-Glossary of the Commission’s Rules, filed in CC Docket No. 96-45, June 30, 2000, at 2 n.3.

13/ Waiver Petition at 1 n.2.

qualifies as an RTC in Texas and New Mexico pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 153(37)(D). In addition, Valor has sought to intervene in Western Wireless' ETC proceedings before the Texas and New Mexico commissions and claimed RTC status for that purpose, even though Valor (i) is not yet providing service in Texas or New Mexico, (ii) has not had the Waiver Petition granted to create a Valor study area in Texas (and has only assumed that it has a study area in New Mexico), and (iii) has not qualified as an RTC.

III. DISCUSSION

Valor does not qualify as an RTC. Valor does not satisfy any of the definitions of an RTC set forth in Section 3(37) of the Act. In addition, Valor should not be accorded RTC status for purposes of ETC designations under Section 214(e)(2) of the Act, because such a result would be profoundly anti-competitive and would contravene long-established Commission policies.

A. Valor Does Not Qualify as an RTC Under Sections 3(37)(A), (B) or (C) of the Act.

Valor seeks RTC status pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 153(37)(D), and thereby essentially concedes that it cannot qualify as an RTC under subsections (A), (B) or (C) of Section 3(37). Indeed, the Waiver Petition reveals that, if the Commission grants the Waiver Petition, Valor will obtain 315,000 access lines in Texas, comprising a single Texas study area for Valor that will include Texarkana, Texas, a city of over 30,000 people. ^{14/} This means that:

^{14/} See Waiver Petition at 1-2, Attachment 1 at 4.

- Valor cannot be an RTC under Section 3(37)(A). Section 3(37)(A) requires that a carrier's study area not include "any incorporated place of 10,000 inhabitants or more, or any part thereof." ^{15/} If and when the Commission allows Valor to establish a study area in Texas, the study area will encompass Texarkana, which has a population of over 10,000. The Waiver Petition also reveals that Valor's proposed service area in New Mexico includes Carlsbad City, which also has a population of over 10,000. ^{16/}
- Valor cannot be an RTC under Section 3(37)(B). Section 3(37)(B) requires that a carrier "provide telephone exchange service, including exchange access, to fewer than 50,000 access lines." ^{17/} Valor will provide service to approximately 315,000 lines in Texas alone, over 80,000 in New Mexico alone, and over 500,000 total if Oklahoma is included.
- Valor cannot be an RTC under Section 3(37)(C). Section 3(37)(C) requires that a carrier "provide telephone exchange service to [a study area] with fewer than 100,000 access lines." ^{18/} If and when the Commission allows Valor to establish a study area in Texas, the study area will have approximately 315,000 lines, well over the 100,000-line threshold. Valor has not claimed that it satisfies this standard in New Mexico, nor has it provided the necessary data to demonstrate that it satisfies the standard.

Thus, Valor cannot qualify as an RTC unless it meets the requirements of Section 3(37)(D) of the Act, which (as we show below) it fails to do.

B. Valor Does Not Qualify as an RTC Under Section 3(37)(D) of the Act

Valor does not meet the RTC criteria in Section 3(37)(D), which requires that a LEC have "less than 15 percent of its access lines in communities of more than 50,000 on the date of enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996." ^{19/} First, Valor was not a LEC on the date of enactment of the 1996 Act, and

^{15/} 47 U.S.C. § 153(37)(A).

^{16/} See Valor RTC Letter at New Mexico Attachment and data page 1.

^{17/} 47 U.S.C. § 153(37)(B).

^{18/} *Id.* § 153(37)(C).

^{19/} *Id.* § 153(37)(D).

Valor did not have “less than 15 percent of its access lines in communities of more than 50,000” on the date the 1996 Act was adopted. In fact, Valor did not have any access lines on that date, and was not even in existence until late 1999. Thus, Section 3(37)(D) on its face does not apply to Valor.

Second, Valor is purchasing exchanges from GTE that have already been disqualified from satisfying the Section 3(37)(D) definition because GTE had substantially more than 15 percent of its access lines in communities of more than 50,000 on February 8, 1996. Valor’s purchase of those exchanges from a non-RTC simply cannot retroactively shoehorn itself into Section 3(37)(D). The FCC adopted the study area freeze, which is “tied directly to the rules and procedures for . . . Universal Service support,” 20/ precisely to “prevent carriers from subdividing study areas to gain an advantage under the [universal service] rules.” 21/ Any interpretation of Section 3(37)(D) that would allow Valor to qualify as an RTC would completely subvert the Commission’s long-established policies in this regard.

Finally, it would be profoundly anti-competitive for Valor’s claimed RTC status to prejudice the ETC status of prospective competitive entrants such as Western Wireless. Thus, even if a new entrant such as Valor, that was not providing service at the time the 1996 Act was adopted, could qualify as an RTC under Section 3(37)(D) for purposes of Section 251(f)(1) or other provisions of the Act, the Commission should hold that the carrier may not be treated as an RTC for

20/ *Section 257 Proceeding to Identify and Eliminate Market Entry Barriers for Small Businesses*, 12 FCC Rcd 16802, ¶ 99 (1997).

21/ *U S WEST Communications, Inc.*, AAD 93-95, Memorandum Opinion and Order, 9 FCC Rcd 4811, ¶ 15 (CCB 1994).

purposes of Section 214(e)(2) of the Act. If the mere purchase of a formerly non-RTC exchange by a new carrier claiming RTC status was sufficient to turn the exchange into “an area served by a rural telephone company” for Section 214(e)(2) purposes, all designated competitive ETCs and applicants for ETC status could be substantially prejudiced:

- Any competitive ETC that had already been designated for a service area incorporating a former non-RTC exchange could face being hauled back before the state commission for a finding that the public interest would be served for the competitive ETC to retain its designation for the transferred exchange(s). Such an outcome was never contemplated by the Section 214(e) protections for RTCs existing as of the date of enactment of the 1996 Act.
- Given the requirement that a competitive ETC serve the whole of an RTC’s study area, an existing competitive ETC serving non-RTC exchanges could suddenly find itself obligated, if some non-RTC exchanges are automatically transformed into an RTC’s study area upon purchase, to serve additional areas, *i.e.*, the balance of that RTC’s study area.
- Any prospective competitive ETC whose petition for designation is pending at the time a putative RTC purchases or otherwise acquires formerly non-RTC exchanges would face a public interest inquiry that it did not face at the time it filed its petition, and which may not be adequately addressed by that petition. To the extent the ETC applicant had already advanced through most of the designation process, it could find itself forced to go back to “square one” and begin the process anew. The unilateral decision of a party that purchases non-RTC exchanges should not dictate the rights of any competitive applicant for ETC designation.
- When an RTC expands its operation to compete in a non-RTC’s service territory as a competitive carrier, it would make that portion of the non-RTC’s service territory “an area served by a rural telephone company” under Section 214(e)(2). This, paradoxically, could result in subjecting the incumbent non-rural LEC to a public interest inquiry as to its continued ETC status, and it could require the same for any competitive ETC already designated in that service territory (as well as for any new competitive ETCs awaiting or contemplating designation). These results are well outside the scope of protected status for RTCs under Section 214(e), and contrary to sound public policy.

Each of these anti-competitive outcomes – none of which were intended by the RTC protections built into the 1996 Act – can be avoided only if the Commission holds

that non-RTC lines and/or exchanges cannot be converted or incorporated into RTC service areas merely by a small telecommunications carrier's purchase of assets from a non-RTC. The Commission should act forcefully to prevent this anti-competitive outcome.


IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Western Wireless respectfully requests that the Commission issue a ruling rejecting Valor's purported self-certification, and concluding that Valor does not qualify as an RTC in Texas or New Mexico under Section 3(37) of the Act.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERN WIRELESS
CORPORATION

Gene DeJordy,
Vice President, Regulatory Affairs
Jim Blundell, Director of External Affairs
WESTERN WIRELESS CORPORATION
3650 - 131st Ave. S.E., Suite 400
Bellevue, WA 98006
(425) 586-8055

By: 
Michele C. Farquhar
David L. Sieradzki
Ronnie London
HOGAN & HARTSON, L.L.P.
555 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 637-5600

Counsel for Western Wireless
Corporation

Dated: July 27, 2000



June 27, 2000

Ms. Sheryl Todd
Universal Service Branch
Accounting and Audits Division, FCC
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Valor Rural Self-Certification

Dear Ms. Todd:

I am writing this letter on behalf of Valor Telecommunications of New Mexico, LLC and Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP. We are a start-up Telecommunications Company formed with the acquisition of over 500,000 access lines from GTE Southwest in Texas, New Mexico and Oklahoma. Valor has received regulatory approval for the purchase of these lines and has been certificated as an incumbent local exchange carrier in all three states.

In Texas, Valor Telecommunications was granted a certificate of convenience and necessity and was designated as an eligible telecommunications carrier by order dated June 14, 2000, in Docket 21834, Application of Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP, for Approval of Sale, Transfer, or Merger, Issuance of a Certificate of Convenience and Necessity, Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Provider, and Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier.

On June 20, 2000, the New Mexico Public Regulation Commission issued its final order in Utility Case No. 3217 approving GTE Southwest's sale of its operating facilities and equipment in New Mexico to Valor; approving GTE Southwest's request to discontinue service in New Mexico; and granting Valor's request for all necessary authority to provide basic local exchange and exchange access services and designation as a Eligible Telecommunications Carrier upon completion of the transaction.

Valor meets the criteria set forth in Section 3(37)(D) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U.S.C §153(37)(D)), for designation as a "rural telephone carrier" in both Texas and New Mexico. Section 3(37)(D) states that a rural telephone company means a local exchange carrier that has less than 15 percent of its access lines in communities of more than 50,000 on the date of enactment of the Telecommunication Act of 1996." As the enclosed data indicates, Valor falls into this category of a rural telephone company in both Texas and New Mexico.

GTE Southwest has provided Valor the enclosed line count information. Valor is expected to close on the acquisition of the Texas and New Mexico lines on September 1, 2000. In addition, the population data is provided by the United States Census Bureau (US Census). Valor seeks to obtain rural telephone carrier status for the year 2001 and as such files this self-certification prior to its close with GTE.

The enclosed line counts for Texas and New Mexico, based on 1999 information provided to Valor by GTE Southwest, show that in Texas, the only central office that services 15% of Valor's access lines is Texarkana and according to the most recent US Census Data of Population Estimates for Consensus Designated Places (which includes communities), Texarkana has 31,485 inhabitants. The line counts also show that in New Mexico that the only central office servicing 15% of Valor's access lines is Carlsbad and according to the US Census data, Carlsbad has 26,315 inhabitants.

Valor Telecommunications Southwest, LLC
600 E. Las Colinas Blvd., Suite 1900, Dallas, TX 75039
Telephone - (972) 373-1000 Facsimile - (972) 373-1050

Valor Telecommunications of New Mexico, LLC

NEW MEXICO

1999 Line Counts

OFFICE	Residential	Business	TOTAL LINES
ABIQUIU	733	117	850
ALTO	2,068	284	2,352
CABALLO RESERVOIR	440	63	503
CANJILON	142	17	159
CAPITAN	1,081	227	1,308
CARLSBAD	12,993	5,500	18,493
CARLSBAD CAVERNS	52	94	146
CHAMA	619	342	961
CHIMAYO	1,422	89	1,511
CUBA	731	295	1,026
DIXON	511	64	575
DULCE	631	388	1,019
EL RITO	357	52	409
ELEPHANT BUTTE	1,181	298	1,479
ESPANOLA	7,796	2,867	10,663
EUNICE	1,079	494	1,573
GALLINA	392	59	451
HILLSBORO	188	29	217
HOBBS MAIN	7,741	4,934	12,675
HOBBS NORTH	5,692	1,969	7,661
JAL	773	271	1,044
JEMEZ SPRINGS	892	158	1,050
LINDRITH	125	38	163
LOVING	616	122	738
LOVINGTON	4,051	1,359	5,410
LYBROOK	45	66	111
MESCALERO	433	244	677
OJO CALIENTE	395	81	476
RUIDOSO	4,291	2,183	6,474
RUIDOSO DOWNS	1,362	711	2,073
RUIDOSO WHITE MOUNTAIN	2,525	718	3,243
SAN YSIDRO	579	184	763
TIERRA AMARILLA 1	721	263	984
TRUCHAS	409	26	435
TRUTH OR CONSEQUENCES	3,653	1,242	4,895
VALLECITOS	70	5	75
VELARDE	2,017	243	2,260
TOTAL	68,806	26,096	94,902
15% OF TOTAL LINES			14,235

(SU-98-7) Population Estimates for Places: Annual Time Series, July 1, 1990 to Jul
(includes revised April 1, 1990 census population counts)

Source: Population Estimates Program, Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau, Wash
Contact: Statistical Information Staff, Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau, (3

Internet Release Date: June 30 1999

Block 1 of 2

FIPS State/County/Place Code and Area Name	7/1/98 Estimated Population	7/1/97 Estimated Population	7/ Estim Popula
35 000 01780 Alamogordo city, NM	20312	20690	2
35 000 02000 Albuquerque city, NM	419311	416834	41
35 000 03400 Angel Fire village, NM	96	97	
35 000 05220 Artesia city, NM	10973	11036	1
35 000 05780 Aztec city, NM	6134	6014	
35 000 06270 Bayard city, NM	2903	2885	
35 000 06480 Belen city, NM	7936	7947	
35 000 06970 Bernalillo town, NM	7570	7369	
35 000 07880 Bloomfield city, NM	6280	6070	
35 000 08580 Bosque Farms village, NM	5645	5493	
35 000 11800 Capitan village, NM	1241	1195	
35 000 12150 Carlsbad city, NM	26315	26232	2
35 000 12500 Carrizozo town, NM	1442	1404	
35 000 12650 Causey village, NM	68	68	
35 000 13590 Central village, NM	2085	2065	
35 000 13970 Chama village, NM	1145	1139	
35 000 15440 Cimarron village, NM	890	886	
35 000 15720 Clayton town, NM	2390	2431	
35 000 16280 Cloudcroft village, NM	616	638	
35 000 16420 Clovis city, NM	32394	33605	3
35 000 17050 Columbus village, NM	902	875	
35 000 17680 Corona village, NM	292	286	
35 000 17960 Corrales village, NM	6633	6519	
35 000 19150 Cuba village, NM	991	962	
35 000 20270 Deming city, NM	14517	14337	1
35 000 20480 Des Moines village, NM	169	170	
35 000 20620 Dexter town, NM	926	950	
35 000 21180 Dora village, NM	193	196	
35 000 22020 Eagle Nest village, NM	217	216	
35 000 23000 Elida town, NM	235	237	
35 000 24610 Encino village, NM	188	179	
35 000 25170 Espanola city, NM	8994	8985	
35 000 25380 Estancia town, NM	1137	1088	
35 000 25450 Eunice city, NM	2842	2828	
35 000 25800 Farmington city, NM	39028	38182	3
35 000 26570 Floyd village, NM	138	140	
35 000 26780 Folsom village, NM	72	72	
35 000 27340 Fort Sumner village, NM	1334	1315	
35 000 28460 Gallup city, NM	20120	20217	2
35 000 30210 Grady village, NM	126	128	
35 000 30450 Grants city, NM	9294	9195	
35 000 30770 Grenville village, NM	24	24	
35 000 31340 Hagerman town, NM	988	1014	
35 000 31820 Hatch village, NM	1400	1378	
35 000 32520 Hobbs city, NM	27156	27469	2
35 000 33290 Hope village, NM	127	124	

35 000 33710	House village, NM	95	94	
35 000 33850	Hurley town, NM	1659	1655	
35 000 35040	Jal city, NM	2271	2263	
35 000 35320	Jemez Springs village, NM	499	489	
35 000 37840	Lake Arthur town, NM	357	365	
35 000 39380	Las Cruces city, NM	76102	75479	7
35 000 39940	Las Vegas city, NM	16487	16545	1
35 000 42040	Logan village, NM	985	964	
35 000 42180	Lordsburg city, NM	2985	3026	
35 000 43370	Los Lunas village, NM	7805	7596	
35 000 43930	Los Ranchos de Albuquerque village, NM	5019	5054	
35 000 44420	Loving village, NM	1471	1450	
35 000 44490	Lovington city, NM	9441	9795	
35 000 46310	Magdalena village, NM	953	946	
35 000 47080	Maxwell village, NM	285	284	
35 000 47570	Melrose village, NM	733	745	
35 000 48060	Mesilla town, NM	1987	2008	
35 000 48620	Milan village, NM	2291	2231	
35 000 50160	Moriarty city, NM	1840	1777	
35 000 50300	Mosquero village, NM	148	148	
35 000 50370	Mountainair town, NM	1282	1230	
35 000 55620	Pecos village, NM	1161	1154	
35 000 59260	Portales city, NM	10857	11064	1
35 000 60870	Questa village, NM	2046	2012	
35 000 62060	Raton city, NM	7466	7589	
35 000 62200	Red River town, NM	434	430	
35 000 62620	Reserve village, NM	366	358	
35 000 63460	Rio Rancho city, NM	50041	48620	4
35 000 64930	Roswell city, NM	47624	47357	4
35 000 65070	Roy village, NM	334	332	
35 000 65210	Ruidoso village, NM	6065	5919	
35 000 65280	Ruidoso Downs village, NM	1227	1196	
35 000 68150	San Jon village, NM	285	283	
35 000 70500	Santa Fe city, NM	67879	67203	6
35 000 70670	Santa Rosa city, NM	2214	2238	
35 000 71020	San Ysidro village, NM	301	293	
35 000 73260	Silver City town, NM	12064	12007	1
35 000 73540	Socorro city, NM	8616	8629	
35 000 74800	Springer town, NM	1427	1426	
35 000 75640	Sunland Park city, NM	9591	9369	
35 000 76200	Taos town, NM	5389	5361	
35 000 76480	Taos Ski Valley village, NM	68	69	
35 000 76620	Tatum town, NM	827	821	
35 000 77250	Texico city, NM	1134	1146	
35 000 77880	Tijeras village, NM	391	389	
35 000 79840	Truth or Consequences city, NM	6564	6555	
35 000 79910	Tucumcari city, NM	5825	5936	
35 000 79980	Tularosa village, NM	2789	2847	
35 000 82570	Vaughn town, NM	606	614	
35 000 83200	Virden village, NM	111	112	
35 000 83340	Wagon Mound village, NM	347	345	
35 000 85160	Willard village, NM	260	249	
35 000 85300	Williamsburg village, NM	553	539	

Block 2 of 2

FIPS State/County/Place Code and Area Name	7/1/93 Estimated Population	7/1/92 Estimated Population	7/ Estim Popula
35 000 01780 Alamogordo city, NM	28001	27531	2

35 000 02000	Albuquerque city, NM	404367	398968	39
35 000 03400	Angel Fire village, NM	95	93	
35 000 05220	Artesia city, NM	11225	11094	1
35 000 05780	Aztec city, NM	5758	5638	
35 000 06270	Bayard city, NM	2660	2677	
35 000 06480	Belen city, NM	7166	6869	
35 000 06970	Bernalillo town, NM	6340	6164	
35 000 07880	Bloomfield city, NM	5563	5410	
35 000 08580	Bosque Farms village, NM	4315	4075	
35 000 11800	Capitan village, NM	951	909	
35 000 12150	Carlsbad city, NM	26576	26171	2
35 000 12500	Carrizozo town, NM	1186	1145	
35 000 12850	Causey village, NM	62	61	
35 000 13590	Central village, NM	1881	1892	
35 000 13970	Chama village, NM	1078	1057	
35 000 15440	Cimarron village, NM	813	791	
35 000 15720	Clayton town, NM	2449	2440	
35 000 16280	Cloudcroft village, NM	634	628	
35 000 16420	Clovis city, NM	34228	33681	3
35 000 17050	Columbus village, NM	748	705	
35 000 17680	Corona village, NM	238	230	
35 000 17960	Corrales village, NM	5833	5701	
35 000 19150	Cuba village, NM	824	799	
35 000 20270	Deming city, NM	13194	12513	1
35 000 20480	Des Moines village, NM	166	165	
35 000 20620	Dexter town, NM	918	905	
35 000 21180	Dora village, NM	180	176	
35 000 22020	Eagle Nest village, NM	198	193	
35 000 23600	Elida town, NM	216	212	
35 000 24610	Encino village, NM	140	135	
35 000 25170	Espanola city, NM	8675	8511	
35 000 25380	Estancia town, NM	852	819	
35 000 25450	Eunice city, NM	2746	2726	
35 000 25800	Farmington city, NM	35971	35153	2
35 000 26570	Floyd village, NM	125	124	
35 000 26780	Folsom village, NM	70	70	
35 000 27340	Fort Sumner village, NM	1292	1281	
35 000 28460	Gallup city, NM	20244	20466	1
35 000 30210	Grady village, NM	119	117	
35 000 30490	Grants city, NM	8712	8577	
35 000 30770	Grenville village, NM	24	23	
35 000 31330	Hagerman town, NM	979	969	
35 000 31820	Hatch village, NM	1269	1220	
35 000 32520	Hobbs city, NM	29013	29092	2
35 000 33290	Hope village, NM	111	107	
35 000 33710	House village, NM	95	94	
35 000 33850	Hurley town, NM	1552	1570	
35 000 35040	Jal city, NM	2209	2193	
35 000 35320	Jemez Springs village, NM	438	429	
35 000 37840	Lake Arthur town, NM	345	339	
35 000 39380	Las Cruces city, NM	70656	67699	6
35 000 39940	Las Vegas city, NM	15924	15727	1
35 000 42040	Logan village, NM	885	866	
35 000 42180	Lordsburg city, NM	2986	2947	
35 000 43370	Los Lunas village, NM	6539	6272	
35 000 43930	Los Ranchos de Albuquerque village, NM	5190	5167	
35 000 44420	Loving village, NM	1356	1325	
35 000 44490	Lovington city, NM	9558	9491	
35 000 46310	Magdalena village, NM	883	872	
35 000 47080	Maxwell village, NM	259	252	
35 000 47570	Metrose village, NM	708	703	
35 000 48060	Mesilla town, NM	2095	2057	
35 000 48620	Milan village, NM	1977	1920	
35 000 50160	Moriarty city, NM	1476	1428	

35 000	50300	Mosquero village, NM	156	166	
35 000	50370	Mountainair town, NM	986	951	
35 000	55620	Pecos Village, NM	1067	1044	
35 000	59260	Portales city, NM	11114	11090	1
35 000	60870	Questa village, NM	1809	1778	
35 000	62060	Raton city, NM	7561	7413	
35 000	62200	Red River town, NM	404	399	
35 000	62620	Reserve village, NM	320	310	
35 000	63460	Rio Rancho city, NM	39283	36582	3
35 000	64930	Roswell city, NM	45540	44905	4
35 000	65070	Roy village, NM	347	367	
35 000	65210	Ruidoso village, NM	5072	4905	
35 000	65280	Ruidoso Downs village, NM	1013	977	
35 000	68150	San Jon village, NM	276	273	
35 000	70500	Santa Fe city, NM	62615	60345	5
35 000	70670	Santa Rosa city, NM	2251	2240	
35 000	71020	San Ysidro village, NM	251	244	
35 000	73260	Silver City town, NM	11230	11361	1
35 000	73540	Socorro city, NM	8424	8297	
35 000	74800	Springer town, NM	1324	1289	
35 000	75640	Sunland Park city, NM	8916	8648	
35 000	76200	Taos town, NM	4928	4754	
35 000	76480	Taos Ski Valley village, NM	66	66	
35 000	76620	Tatum town, NM	791	783	
35 000	77250	Texico city, NM	1048	1034	
35 000	77880	Tijeras village, NM	362	355	
35 000	79840	Truth or Consequences city, NM	6471	6248	
35 000	79910	Tucumcari city, NM	6539	6561	
35 000	79980	Tularosa village, NM	2677	2627	
35 000	82570	Vaughn town, NM	625	624	
35 000	83200	Virden village, NM	108	108	
35 000	83340	Wagon Mound village, NM	322	317	
35 000	85160	Willard village, NM	194	188	
35 000	85300	Williamsburg village, NM	482	460	

Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP

TEXAS

1999 Line Counts

OFFICE	Residential	Business	TOTAL LINES
ABERNATHY	1,137	251	1,388
ADRIAN	126	39	165
AMHERST	364	80	444
ANDREWS	4,936	1,672	6,608
ANNOA	324	34	358
ANTON	592	92	684
ASPERMONT	586	248	834
AUSTONIO	449	44	493
AVALON	218	58	276
AVERY	1,004	66	1,070
AVINGER	501	97	598
BAGWELL	148	14	162
BAIRD	947	313	1,260
BALMORHEA	353	106	459
BECKVILLE	867	107	974
BEDIAS	884	53	937
BENJAMIN	130	58	188
BLACKWELL	437	48	485
BLOOMING	924	91	1,015
BOGATA	1,570	225	1,795
BON WIER	435	69	504
BOOKER	603	237	840
BOVINA	555	116	671
BOYS RANCH	146	61	207
BROADDUS	617	102	719
BRONSON	442	18	460
BROWNFIELD	3,730	1,456	5,186
BUFFALO	1,983	549	2,532
BURKEVILLE	1,228	149	1,377
BURLINGTON	98	7	105
BYNUM	140	18	158
CACTUS	530	257	787
CENTERVILLE	1,613	469	2,082
CHANNING	180	45	225
CHILTON	661	74	735
CLARENDON	1,571	455	2,026
CLARKSVILLE	2,337	802	3,139
CLAUDE	583	163	746
CLYDE	2,735	420	3,155
COLMESNEIL	1,197	118	1,315
COYANOSA	75	73	148
CRAWFORD	561	46	607
CROCKETT	5,231	2,031	7,262
CROSBYTON	808	314	1,122
CROSS PLAINS	1,107	227	1,334
CUSHING	1,006	135	1,141
DAINGERFIELD	2,601	711	3,312
DALHART	1,681	676	2,357
DARROUZETT	190	69	259
DAWSON	811	92	903
DEKALB	2,483	354	2,837
DENVER CITY	1,986	1,089	3,075

Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP

TEXAS

1999 Line Counts

OFFICE	Residential	Business	TOTAL LINES
DEPORT	828	104	932
DETROIT	796	89	865
DIMMITT	1,851	827	2,678
DODSON	90	12	102
DOUGLASSVILLE	699	66	765
DUMAS 1	5,777	2,057	7,834
ELKHART	1,629	225	1,854
ESTELLINE	103	30	133
FABENS	2,811	602	3,413
FAIRFIELD	3,888	1,288	5,176
FAIRMOUNT	1,511	83	1,594
FOLLETT	260	74	334
FORSAN	96	62	158
FORT HANCOCK	400	96	496
FRANKEL CITY	16	58	74
FRANKLIN	2,252	490	2,742
FRIONA	349	114	463
FRITCH	2,439	280	2,719
FROST	421	73	494
GARY	601	73	674
GLEN ROSE	2,792	1,196	3,988
GRAPELAND	1,958	373	2,331
GROOM	405	127	532
GROVETON	1,122	319	1,441
HAPPY	308	72	380
HART	459	136	595
HARTLEY	209	89	298
HASKELL	1,601	747	2,348
HEDLEY	247	38	285
HEMPHILL	1,750	639	2,389
HIGGINS	306	91	397
HILLTOP LAKES	620	46	666
HOLLIDAY	950	156	1,106
HOOKS	2,244	318	2,562
HUBBARD	928	182	1,110
HUGHES SPRINGS	1,741	526	2,267
HUNTINGTON	2,531	318	2,849
HURLWOOD	826	147	973
IDALOU	1,153	205	1,358
IMPERIAL	120	27	147
IOLA	919	96	1,015
IRENE	412	13	425
JOAQUIN	1,188	151	1,339
KAMAY	496	58	554
KARNACK	1,099	123	1,222
KENNARD	700	90	790
KNOX CITY	740	297	1,037
LAKEVIEW	120	19	139
LAMESA	4,147	1,580	5,727
LEONA	423	50	473
LEVELLAND	6,016	2,240	8,256
LINDEN	1,887	524	2,411

Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP

TEXAS

1999 Line Counts

OFFICE	Residential	Business	TOTAL LINES
LITTLEFIELD	2,677	927	3,604
LONE STAR	1,055	1,048	2,103
LORAINÉ	400	49	449
LORENZO	521	117	638
LOTT	660	91	751
LOVELADY	1,017	125	1,142
MALONE	389	53	442
MARIETTA	915	63	978
MARQUEZ	596	85	681
MAUD	1,224	137	1,361
MAY	332	38	370
MEADOW	250	38	288
MEGARGEL	177	40	217
MEMPHIS	1,087	430	1,517
MENTONE	24	27	51
MERKEL	1,767	356	2,123
MIAMI	339	113	452
MILAM	1,231	112	1,343
MILFORD	386	48	434
MOBEETIE	125	24	149
MORAN	214	38	252
MORGAN	256	38	294
MORTON	810	309	1,119
MOUNT CALM	337	40	377
MUNDAY	915	262	1,177
NAPLES	972	195	1,167
NAZARETH	270	54	324
NEGLEY	325	7	332
NEW BOSTON	3,468	1,063	4,531
NEWTON	1,497	444	1,941
NORMANGEE	1,094	203	1,297
NORTH ZULCH	714	72	786
OAKWOOD	600	77	677
ORLA	16	35	51
PANHANDLE	1,280	335	1,615
PECOS 445	2,265	978	3,243
PECOS 447	1,436	561	1,997
PENNINGTON	298	22	320
PERRYTON	3,535	1,781	5,316
PETERSBURG	550	132	682
PINELAND	1,283	255	1,538
POST	1,441	580	2,021
PURDON	490	30	520
PUTNAM	75	28	103
RALLS	818	227	1,045
REDWATER	1,189	104	1,293
REKLAW	185	29	214
RICHLAND	252	23	275
RIESEL	887	78	965
RISING STAR	836	129	965
ROCHESTER	247	59	306
ROGERS	777	140	917

Valor Telecommunications of Texas, LP

TEXAS

1999 Line Counts

OFFICE	Residential	Business	TOTAL LINES
ROPESVILLE	363	80	443
ROSEBUD	1,189	198	1,387
RULE	418	79	497
SANFORD	201	43	244
SEAGRAVES	568	290	858
SEYMOUR	1,622	574	2,196
SHALLOWATER	1,468	164	1,632
SIERRA BLANCA	185	183	368
SIMMS	846	51	897
SLOCUM	560	47	607
SMYER	388	60	448
SPADE	105	21	126
SPEARMAN	1,552	612	2,164
STRATFORD	440	201	641
STREETMAN	748	204	952
SUNDOWN	619	301	920
SUNRAY	865	261	1,126
TAHOKA	1,097	343	1,440
TENAHA	987	164	1,151
TEXARKANA	38,358	21,519	59,877
THROCKMORTON	519	205	724
TOYAH	50	30	80
TRENT	274	58	332
TRINITY MAIN	5,380	899	6,279
TULIA	1,890	740	2,630
UNCERTAIN	242	47	289
VALENTINE	67	22	89
VAN HORN	860	673	1,533
VEGA	564	212	776
WALNUT	528	71	599
WEINERT	100	19	119
WELLINGTON	1,210	411	1,621
WHEELER	800	351	1,151
WHITE DEER	562	111	673
WHITEFACE	227	64	291
WHITHARRAL	155	18	173
WHITNEY	4,528	955	5,483
WILDORADO	187	40	227
WILSON	234	54	288
WOLFFORTH	1,708	595	2,303
ZAVALLA	1,439	142	1,581
TOTAL	242,262	76,135	318,397
15% OF TOTAL LINES			47,759.55

(SU-98-7) Population Estimates for Places: Annual Time Series, July 1, 1990 to Jul
(includes revised April 1, 1990 census population counts)

Source: Population Estimates Program, Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau, Wash
Contact: Statistical Information Staff, Population Division, U.S. Census Bureau, (3

Internet Release Date: June 30 1999

Block 1 of 2

FIPS State/Country/Place Code and Area Name	7/1/98 Estimated Population	7/1/97 Estimated Population	7/ Estin Popula
48 000 00100 Abbott city, TX	348	343	
48 000 00160 Abernathy city, TX	2783	2772	
48 000 01000 Abilene city, TX	108257	107398	10
48 000 01108 Ackerly city, TX	226	228	
48 000 01240 Addison town, TX	12276	12106	1
48 000 01324 Adrian city, TX	212	221	
48 000 01396 Agua Dulce city, TX	814	827	
48 000 01576 Alamo city, TX	11078	10782	1
48 000 01600 Alamo Heights city, TX	6839	6825	
48 000 01636 Alba town, TX	554	551	
48 000 01648 Albany city, TX	1883	1895	
48 000 01744 Aledo city, TX	1653	1555	
48 000 01852 Alice city, TX	20532	20489	2
48 000 01924 Allen city, TX	38941	35183	3
48 000 02044 Alma town, TX	233	228	
48 000 02104 Alpine city, TX	5803	5938	
48 000 02188 Alto town, TX	1020	1015	
48 000 02212 Alton city, TX	3845	3769	
48 000 02260 Alvarado city, TX	3345	3233	
48 000 02272 Alvin city, TX	20797	20603	2
48 000 02284 Alvord town, TX	1038	998	
48 000 03000 Amarillo city, TX	171207	170354	16
48 000 03072 Ames city, TX	1187	1172	
48 000 03084 Amherst city, TX	702	708	
48 000 03144 Anahuac city, TX	2011	2019	
48 000 03192 Anderson town, TX	301	295	
48 000 03216 Andrews city, TX	10273	10267	1
48 000 03264 Angleton city, TX	20518	20257	2
48 000 03286 Angus city, TX	443	425	
48 000 03300 Anna city, TX	1008	1005	
48 000 03336 Annetta town, TX	801	781	
48 000 03340 Annetta North town, TX	315	309	
48 000 03342 Annetta South town, TX	488	478	
48 000 03360 Annona town, TX	302	305	
48 000 03372 Anson city, TX	2426	2454	
48 000 03432 Anthony town, TX	3616	3579	
48 000 03440 Anton city, TX	1134	1149	
48 000 03564 Appleby city, TX	468	471	
48 000 03588 Aquilla city, TX	155	151	
48 000 03600 Aransas Pass city, TX	8188	8020	
48 000 03696 Archer City city, TX	1797	1802	
48 000 03708 Arcola city, TX	929	891	
48 000 03768 Argyle city, TX	2323	2229	
48 000 04000 Arlington city, TX	306497	298889	29
48 000 04156 Arp city, TX	863	856	
48 000 04300 Asherton city, TX	1528	1540	

48 000 04408	Aspermont town, TX	1092	1104	
48 000 04504	Athens city, TX	11822	11733	1
48 000 04516	Atlanta city, TX	5571	5618	
48 000 04600	Aubrey city, TX	1303	1277	
48 000 04672	Aurora town, TX	812	775	
48 000 05000	Austin city, TX	552434	542095	53
48 000 05036	Austwell city, TX	180	180	
48 000 05072	Avery town, TX	410	412	
48 000 05084	Avinger town, TX	495	492	
48 000 05168	Azle city, TX	10345	10168	
48 000 05264	Bailey city, TX	200	197	
48 000 05288	Bailey's Prairie village, TX	781	754	
48 000 05336	Baird city, TX	1762	1760	
48 000 05372	Balch Springs city, TX	18435	18379	1
48 000 05384	Balcones Heights city, TX	3202	3193	
48 000 05456	Ballinger city, TX	4003	3991	
48 000 05468	Balmorhea city, TX	742	744	
48 000 05528	Bandera city, TX	1311	1264	
48 000 05552	Bangs city, TX	1512	1608	
48 000 05612	Bardwell city, TX	458	446	
48 000 05708	Barry city, TX	186	182	
48 000 05720	Barstow town, TX	507	502	
48 000 05732	Bartlett city, TX	1645	1643	
48 000 05768	Bartonville town, TX	1039	1015	
48 000 05864	Bastrop city, TX	5276	5162	
48 000 05984	Bay City city, TX	18386	18451	1
48 000 06060	Bayou Vista village, TX	1510	1489	
48 000 06104	Bayside town, TX	382	382	
48 000 06128	Baytown city, TX	68588	68275	6
48 000 06140	Bayview town, TX	263	258	
48 000 06200	Beach City town, TX	1090	1060	
48 000 06272	Beasley town, TX	711	681	
48 000 07000	Beaumont city, TX	109841	109971	11
48 000 07108	Beckville city, TX	793	795	
48 000 07132	Bedford city, TX	50148	49684	4
48 000 07156	Bee Cave village, TX	438	358	
48 000 07192	Beeville city, TX	13736	13889	1
48 000 07300	Bellaire city, TX	15506	15195	1
48 000 07396	Bellevue city, TX	355	351	
48 000 07408	Bellmead city, TX	9147	9049	
48 000 07420	Bells town, TX	1058	1052	
48 000 07432	Bellville city, TX	3983	3906	
48 000 07492	Belton city, TX	15639	14753	1
48 000 07528	Benavides city, TX	1782	1777	
48 000 07552	Benbrook city, TX	21742	21431	2
48 000 07636	Benjamin city, TX	210	212	
48 000 07852	Berryville town, TX	889	869	
48 000 07864	Bertram city, TX	1119	1081	
48 000 08104	Beverly Hills city, TX	2093	2104	
48 000 08128	Bevil Oaks town, TX	1421	1413	
48 000 08212	Big Lake city, TX	3442	3435	
48 000 08224	Big Sandy town, TX	1376	1359	
48 000 08236	Big Spring city, TX	22382	22847	2
48 000 08260	Big Wells city, TX	745	750	
48 000 08392	Bishop city, TX	3456	3502	
48 000 08488	Blackwell town, TX	345	342	
48 000 08536	Blanco city, TX	1765	1726	
48 000 08596	Blanket town, TX	384	385	
48 000 08752	Bloomburg town, TX	396	392	
48 000 08788	Blooming Grove town, TX	870	857	
48 000 08812	Blossom city, TX	1474	1468	
48 000 08860	Blue Mound city, TX	2563	2530	
48 000 08872	Blue Ridge city, TX	595	577	
48 000 09004	Blum town, TX	406	398	

48 000 09160	Boerne city, TX	6170	6019	
48 000 09172	Bogata town, TX	1319	1339	
48 000 09328	Bonham city, TX	7306	7083	
48 000 09388	Bonney village, TX	436	417	
48 000 09448	Bocker town, TX	1141	1159	
48 000 09556	Borger city, TX	14444	14428	1
48 000 09628	Bovina city, TX	1617	1623	
48 000 09640	Bowie city, TX	5412	5368	
48 000 09748	Boyd town, TX	1319	1271	
48 000 09868	Brackettville city, TX	1919	1870	
48 000 09916	Brady city, TX	5879	5926	
48 000 10072	Brazoria city, TX	2950	2924	
48 000 10132	Breckenridge city, TX	5804	5933	
48 000 10144	Bremond city, TX	1098	1116	
48 000 10156	Brenham city, TX	13661	13539	1
48 000 10197	Briarcliff village, TX	502	481	
48 000 10216	Briar Oaks city, TX	592	581	
48 000 10252	Bridge City city, TX	8231	8236	
48 000 10264	Bridgeport city, TX	4362	4214	
48 000 10384	Broadus town, TX	219	219	
48 000 10528	Bronte town, TX	924	939	
48 000 10636	Brookshire city, TX	3333	3289	
48 000 10648	Brookside Village city, TX	1792	1774	
48 000 10708	Browndell city, TX	213	210	
48 000 10720	Brownfield city, TX	8977	9055	
48 000 10756	Brownsboro city, TX	609	603	
48 000 10768	Brownsville city, TX	137883	134562	13
48 000 10780	Brownwood city, TX	19235	19170	1
48 000 10828	Bruceville-Eddy city, TX	1166	1158	
48 000 10912	Bryan city, TX	58763	58715	5
48 000 10960	Bryson city, TX	561	551	
48 000 11020	Buckholts town, TX	353	351	
48 000 11056	Buckingham town, TX	2731	2716	
48 000 11080	Buda city, TX	2306	2243	
48 000 11116	Buffalo city, TX	1784	1779	
48 000 11128	Buffalo Gap town, TX	506	501	
48 000 11155	Buffalo Springs village, TX	434	443	
48 000 11212	Bullard town, TX	1258	1196	
48 000 11300	Bunker Hill Village city, TX	3759	3721	
48 000 11368	Burkburnett city, TX	10673	10646	1
48 000 11380	Burke city, TX	338	333	
48 000 11428	Burleson city, TX	20817	19934	1
48 000 11464	Burnet city, TX	4563	4425	
48 000 11536	Burton town, TX	316	315	
48 000 11644	Byers city, TX	552	544	
48 000 11656	Bynum town, TX	210	208	
48 000 11692	Cactus city, TX	1886	1816	
48 000 11716	Caddo Mills city, TX	1146	1132	
48 000 11836	Caldwell city, TX	3575	3533	
48 000 11968	Callisburg town, TX	377	374	
48 000 11992	Calvert city, TX	1523	1523	
48 000 12040	Cameron city, TX	5951	5916	
48 000 12112	Campbell town, TX	742	731	
48 000 12388	Camp Wood city, TX	747	754	
48 000 12412	Canadian town, TX	2276	2327	
48 000 12472	Caney City town, TX	204	199	
48 000 12496	Canton city, TX	3263	3218	
48 000 12532	Canyon city, TX	13346	13257	1
48 000 12736	Carbon town, TX	255	257	
48 000 12895	Carl's Corner town, TX	223	109	
48 000 12916	Carmine city, TX	194	192	
48 000 12988	Carrizo Springs city, TX	5779	5815	
48 000 13024	Carrollton city, TX	100463	97783	5
48 000 13108	Carthage city, TX	6813	6832	